

lowed by universities or other bodies. I propose therefore to ask that the House do not concur in this amendment. I move:

That the House do not concur in the third amendment of the Senate, for the reason that, inasmuch as the practice to allowing candidates to get copies of their examination papers, after such examination, would be unusual and contrary to the rules, adopted in universities and other bodies, where similar examinations are required.

Mr. BLAKE. I recollect when my hon. friend from North York (Mr. Mulock) was severely lectured by the Secretary of State when he ventured to make the suggestion that the proposed amendment of the Senate was objectionable. The hon. member for North York has his revenge.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The hon. member for North York said that never at the bar examinations was such a thing allowed. I said I knew it was allowed, and I ascertained it was allowed, but it is not allowed now. I had no special objection or dislike to the amendment, and I said I did not see any danger in allowing candidates to get back their papers, but to prevent objection and be in accord with the practice of other institutions, I am willing to move that the Senate amendment be not concurred in. There is no revenge to be had, and there is no satisfaction in that revenge.

Mr. BLAKE. There is no more revenge to be had.

Motion agreed to, and amendments concurred in.

ANIMAL CONTAGIOUS DISEASE BILL.

Mr. POPE moved the second reading of amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 44) respecting infectious or contagious diseases affecting animals.

Mr. BLAKE. Explain.

Mr. POPE. They made an amendment in the other House which I do not think was very necessary, adding after the word "horses" the words "where specially mentioned." I do not think it can do much harm, and it practically makes no difference in the Bill.

Mr. BLAKE. My hon. friend has ascertained that this practically leaves the measure, so far as horses are concerned, in the same position as it left this House. I had some apprehension that the added words must have some occult meaning, but as the hon. gentleman assures us that there is none, and the Senate asks us to state simply that, where we specially say "horses" we mean horses, we may leave it like the other chips in the porridge.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (Oxford). I am sorry that the Minister accepts the amendment, which I think is very objectionable in view of the almost unanimous vote of this House to strike out the provision in regard to horses.

Mr. POPE. I think it would be better if that were carried out by the Local Governments, some of which have already made arrangements in regard to it, and I have no doubt the others will follow. We must take the responsibility of quarantine and of prohibiting if there is danger.

Mr. BLAKE. My hon. friend from Oxford seems to think that this makes an alteration in the Bill as it was adopted here, but I understood the Minister to say that it did not.

Mr. POPE. Not the slightest alteration in the world.

Amendments concurred in.

PROOF OF OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS.

Mr. CHAPLEAU moved second reading of Bill (No. 113) respecting proof of entries in books of account kept by officers of the Crown. He said: The Bill is to provide

that copies, on the oath of an officer of any Department, in reference to any entries produced in a court, will be considered as *prima facie* evidence in either civil or criminal cases. It is to prevent the carrying outside of the Departments before the courts the original registers or books.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Does the hon. gentleman intend to provide that the contents of books can be proved by either one or the other of the officers named in the Bill, or is an officer bound to make the affidavit in each case?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It must be by two persons, one to the effect that the entry was made in the ordinary course in such a book, and that the book is in the custody or the control of the officer, and another witness to show that he has examined the copy with the original and that it is a true copy from such book.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Then, in order to establish this piece of evidence from one of the public books, you require to have the evidence of two individuals, the one makes an oath or affidavit that such a book was at the time of the making of the entry one of the ordinary books kept by the officer, that he made the entry, and that the book is still in his custody or control, and the other must be the man who compared the copy with the original. The first must not only have made the entry and have had the book under his control then, but at the time of making the affidavit he must still have the book under his control. But that is not sufficient, for somebody else has to make another affidavit that he has compared the copy with the original entry. Now is that what the hon. gentleman means? Does he mean that in order to establish this piece of evidence he requires two witnesses? Because it is perfectly absurd if he does so. Why should there be any necessity for that? We ought to be able to prove a document, or the entry of a public document, by the certificate of the head of the Department, or the deputy head, that it is a true and correct extract from the book. But under the clause before you, you will never be able to prove the entry in a book by this mode. Suppose, for instance, that the officer is changed from one Department and goes to another. Suppose a clerk in the Department of Finance is transferred to the office of the Secretary of State; he cannot make an affidavit according to sub-section a, because, under that section, the man who makes the affidavit requires to be the same person who originally had control of the book, and he requires still to have control of the book. But when the clerk's position is changed in the Department, he does not control the book, therefore he cannot make this affidavit, because, by the absurd way in which this Bill has been drafted, this official must, before he can make the affidavit, have been in control of the books, they must have been in his hands originally when he made the entry, and the book in which he made the entry must be still under his control at the time he makes the affidavit. If the hon. gentleman will adopt the law of Ontario, where extracts from books in the Crown Lands Department and public officers can be established by a certified copy, certified to be a true copy under the hand of the head of the Department or the Deputy head, he will have a feasible mode of attaining his object. But no person will avail himself of such a mode as this in order to prove an entry in one of the public books. It would be far cheaper and better for him to subpoena the clerk of the Department to produce the original document, than to procure the affidavits required by this section. I believe this Bill originated in the Senate; I do not know who had charge of it, but the Senate must have had little to do when they prepared a Bill of this kind. It is the most absurd Bill I ever saw in my life. In Ontario you can have, not only entries in books, but you can prove documents that are filed in the Department, and you can prove the existence of certain other documents by producing extracts of them