

mitted to the Speaker. It may be observed in connection with the remarks of the hon. gentlemen from Lunenburg, which should certainly be taken with the greatest consideration, that there is no doubt whatever it is desirable there should be legal advice upon those committees. It is an unpleasant duty that I have been sometimes compelled to perform myself, but it is quite evident that where there are four or five of the cases going on at the same time, and it is desirable to get them there, that the same parties cannot sit on all the committees. The number of barristers in the House is limited, unfortunately perhaps for us all, but as some gentlemen of legal standing are appointed on the committee it is sufficient guarantee that all the technical and legal forms will be observed. I do not at all agree with my hon. friend in maintaining that evidence adduced in these cases—(that is the evidence generally,—requires a legal mind to understand it,—I mean a trained legal mind, because I think men of judgment and business capacity, as I presume, are all the gentlemen sent to this House, are competent to consider the evidence, because the committee is after all a sort of jury, and it is left in charge of gentlemen of high legal understanding. As I said before, it is impossible to meet the views of the hon. gentleman from Lunenburg in full. The hon. gentleman from Alma came to me and, as far as I thought I had the right to advise him, I told him I thought the committee was properly constituted.

The motion was agreed to on a division.

## RIDDELL DIVORCE BILL.

### PETITION READ.

The order of the day being called for the reading of the petition of Margaret Riddell, praying for an Act to dissolve her marriage with George Field Herchmer,

HON. MR. OGILVIE presented to the House the certificate of the Clerk of the Senate as regards the deposit of \$200 by the petitioner. He moved that the petition be now read and received.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—Has the affidavit of service been put in?

HON. MR. OGILVIE—I was about to read it. There is an affidavit here of the notice having been properly served on the Respondent in Roger's Pass in the Rocky Mountains, by Stephen Edwards, Sheriff of Kootenay.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—I do not see any special objection in this case, only it does not show that it is a copy of the *Gazette* notice. Our rule says that it shall be a copy of the *Gazette* notice, and there is no evidence here of a comparison with the *Gazette* notice; therefore unless my hon. friend can say that he has compared that notice with the notice in the *Canada Gazette* it would not be satisfactory to my mind. I will admit that on other occasions that defect has been passed over. I believe that in a case of which I had charge there was a similar objection, but it was not my place to raise it. I raise it now, but if my hon. friend will say that he has compared it with the *Gazette* notice, and that it is a true copy, my objection will be waived.

THE SPEAKER—All that evidence goes before the Committee.

HON. MR. OGILVIE—If my hon. friend will allow it to go before the Standing Orders Committee to-morrow the matter can be inquired into.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—I will waive my objection. There certainly must be a notice, and that notice must be published in the *Gazette*, and the affidavit must show that the notice served upon the party respondent was a duplicate of that in the *Gazette*. I shall not press the objection, as my hon. friend believes that I am disposed to act rather critically in his cases.

The motion was agreed to, and the petition was read and received.

The Senate adjourned at 5:05 p.m.