

Hon. Mr. CLEMOV introduced Bill (C) "An Act for the relief of Mary Bradshaw Falding."

The bill was read the first time.

#### THE JARVIS DIVORCE CASE.

##### MOTION.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED moved the adoption of the Third Report of the Committee on Divorce *re* Helen Woodburn Jarvis. He said: What I have said with regard to the two preceding reports applies equally well to this report.

The motion was agreed to on a division.

Hon. Mr. CLEMOV introduced Bill (D) "An Act for the relief of Helen Woodburn Jarvis."

The bill was read the first time.

#### THE ODELL DIVORCE CASE.

##### MOTION.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED moved the adoption of the fourth report of the committee on Divorce *re* Luke Sewell Odell petition. He said: There has been a counter petition filed in answer to the petition of the applicant herein. It seems that in this particular matter the applicant, previous to taking proceedings for the passage of this bill, had instituted proceedings *en séparation de corps et de biens* in the Superior Court of Quebec. The trial judge pronounced judgment in favour of the petitioner upon those proceedings. There was afterwards an appeal taken from the Superior Court to the Court of Queen's Bench in the same province, and the five judges constituting the Court of Appeal unanimously reversed the decision of the court of first instance, I understand. The petitioner, or the applicant—because there are two petitioners—the applicant, Luke Sewell Odell, then instituted an appeal in the Supreme Court of Canada from the finding of the Court of Queen's Bench, reversing the judgment of the court of first instance, but in the meantime he had instituted proceedings here for the purpose of obtaining a bill of divorce from Parliament. The counter petition desires that the proceedings before this House should be stayed, pending the hearing of the case before the Supreme Court of Canada. The disposition of the

committee is that there should be no interference with the proceedings now pending before the courts, but that all the facts should be before the committee. It was thought desirable that both parties should be heard before the committee by their counsel in regard to this counter petition. The applicant, apparently, has not been served with notice of this counter petition having been laid, and therefore, in justice to both parties, it was thought desirable that an opportunity should be given to them to appear before the committee and to show cause why the proceedings should be continued before Parliament, or why they should be stayed before Parliament, pending the proceedings to which I have already referred. The report, therefore, recommends that notice be served on both parties to appear before the committee and show cause why the proceedings should be continued, or stayed, as the case may be.

Hon. Mr. CLEMOV—Does that necessarily affect the first reading of the bill?

Hon. Mr. KAULBACH—No.

Hon. Mr. CLEMOV—I understand everything is ready, as far as the application to this House is concerned, and the only thing is the consideration of this counter petition.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—Yes, everything is quite regular, according to the rules.

Hon. Mr. CLEMOV—I thought the bill might be introduced to-day and taken into consideration at another time. However, if it is understood that it will not be delayed in any way, I have no objection. Of course, it cannot be heard until after the adjournment.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—I would suggest to my hon. friend from Rideau Division that if the steps were taken at once, it might be possible to have the parties appear before the committee before the adjournment takes place. I do not know whether they have to come from Quebec, but I understand the solicitors for the applicant are Ottawa gentlemen. I am unaware who the solicitors for the respondent are. Possibly they may be here also and appear before the committee.