

forward satisfied the Senate and the Private Bills Committee of this House, and if that evidence was put in by express agreement, the House can well proceed to give a third reading to the Bill.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE (North Simcoe): I rise to a point of order. If there is any merit in the objection to the third reading of the Bill, that evidence was taken before the committee without the consent of the House, that applies only to the Senate, and the point should be raised only in the Senate. The Senate having passed over that irregularity, have passed the measure over to us for our consideration and conclusion.

Obviously, we have no right to raise a question as to the irregularity of the proceedings of the Senate. For that reason I would ask you, Mr. Speaker, to give your ruling on that point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: The point of order raised by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) is, I have no doubt, well taken. It seems to me that when a measure comes to us from the other chamber, certified to by its proper officer as having been duly passed, and in regular form, we must be governed by that, and it is not for us to go back and make inquiry as to the regularity of the steps which were taken, or as to whether the proceedings were properly conducted by that body.

Mr. KNOWLES: May I speak to the point of order, before you give your decision?

Mr. SPEAKER: I have no objection to the hon. member expressing his views, although I have my mind pretty well made up.

Mr. KNOWLES: I am sure that no person would take any exception to the spirit which animates the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. Currie), namely, that we must show the utmost respect for the proceedings of the Senate. The Chairman of the Private Bills Committee is in his place. He believes that his motion is quite in order and quite proper, and he has supported it with certain observations in regard to what might have happened in the Senate. But the Chairman of the Private Bills Committee will excuse me, I am sure, if I speak for him to this extent when I say that there is no thought of casting any reflection on the Senate. I fancy that the Senate were desirous, just the same as we are, to do the correct thing, and we would

[Mr. Northrup.]

respectfully bring that question up if it went back to the Private Bills Committee. Surely no offence could be taken by the other chamber. We try to treat one another with the utmost respect and we are all friends. I would submit that the motion is strictly in order, and that it is a perfectly proper procedure to send this Bill back to the Commons Private Bills Committee so that we may have the matter properly cleared up. From the record which is in our hands, it appears that an inaccuracy has crept in. I would refer the House to page 10 of the evidence, and it will see that the record contains 70 pages of evidence taken in 1915. That is bound up with the evidence taken this year. It is within these 70 pages that the evidence with regard to the alleged offence of adultery is contained. There was no doubt that it was by inadvertence that the evidence was admitted by the Senate. If we were to address an interrogation to the Senate or call their attention to the fact that the rule of the House seems to have been unintentionally controverted, I am sure that they would agree that such was the case and that they would take steps to see that the matter was properly rectified. If hon. gentlemen will look at page 10 of the evidence they will see that it reads:

Evidence Taken on Petition of 1915.
Minutes of Evidence.

The Senate,
Ottawa, March 15, 1915.

That evidence extends from page 10 to page 79.

I would support the motion that the report be referred back to the Private Bills Committee, because I think that if the Private Bills Committee had understood the position, the Bill would not have been reported until this matter was cleared up.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Moosejaw (Mr. Knowles) must have misapprehended the point raised by the member for North Simcoe, which has nothing to do with the motion submitted by the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Steele). The point of order raised by the hon. member for North Simcoe had to be with the reasons assigned by the mover of this amendment. If his point of order is based upon that ground it is well taken, inasmuch as it calls in question the action of the Upper Chamber. But that does not vitiate the motion made by the hon. member for South Perth.