

## Private Bills—Divorce

ERWIN THOMAS STEPPAN

The house in committee on Bill No. SD-30, for the relief of Erwin Thomas Steppan—Mr. McCleave—Mr. Rea in the chair.

On clause 1—*Marriage dissolved.*

**Mr. Howard:** Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether I might make a comment or two with respect to Bill No. SD-30. In the petition the allegation is made that the petitioner and the respondent were married on or about January 24, 1942 at the city of Montreal in the district of Montreal. It is also alleged that at the time of the marriage the petitioner and the respondent, the husband and wife, were domiciled in Canada and have since continued to be and are now domiciled in Canada, in the province of Quebec. There is reference to the current domicile and in paragraph No. 6 it is alleged that on or about January 26, 1959 at a certain address in the district of Montreal adultery took place between the wife and the co-respondent whose name and address are given here.

Attempting to prove those questions which are germane, the petitioner appeared as a witness, was sworn and was asked certain questions by the clerk of the committee. He gave his name, occupation and address and then he was asked by the clerk of the committee:

Q. Are you married?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. To whom?

He gives the name of the respondent in the case and spells the name.

Q. When were you married?

He gives the church they were married in and their faith. He is then shown a document and asked these questions.

Q. Do you recognize this document I show you?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. What is it?

A. My marriage certificate.

Q. Are the statements contained in it true?

A. Yes.

Q. Except for the discrepancy in the spelling of your wife's name?

A. Yes.

Then the marriage certificate is filed and marked exhibit 1. He is then shown a photograph which he says is a true likeness of his wife and was taken approximately four years ago. So the reference in the petition to marriage has been proved by the evidence so far submitted. Some additional questions are then asked by Mr. Seguin of the city of Ottawa who appeared as counsel for the petitioner. With respect to the question of domicile these questions were asked:

Q. You told us you lived in Montreal. How long have you lived in Montreal?

A. Since 1923, the day I came to this country.

Q. When you emigrated to Canada?

A. Yes.

Q. You have lived ever since in Montreal, in the province of Quebec?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And you have never moved out of that province?

A. No, sir.

**Mr. Broome:** On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, is the hon. member allowed to waste the time of the committee simply by reading and occasionally paraphrasing the evidence given before the committee? I believe there is a rule that quotations shall not be of undue length and shall have something to do with the point the hon. member is making. All the hon. member is doing is simply reading the evidence and certainly the rules of the house must provide that that cannot be allowed.

**The Deputy Chairman:** I appreciate any guidance hon. members can give me. If the hon. member can refer me to a citation covering this matter the Chair will be happy to entertain it.

**Mr. Howard:** I will not speak on the point of order because this question has been raised on a number of occasions and has been dealt with.

**Mr. Hodgson:** You just want to hold up the house for no reason at all.

**Mr. Broome:** Just a smart aleck.

**The Deputy Chairman:** Order.

**Mr. Howard:** I do not hear these comments that are made by people who sit in their seats.

**Mr. Broome:** You certainly don't want to hear them.

**Mr. Howard:** It is strictly against the rules.

**An hon. Member:** What do you know about it?

**Mr. Broome:** What consideration have you for the rules? None whatsoever.

**Mr. Howard:** If hon. members want to speak there is a proper way of doing so instead of sitting in their seats and barking out comments like puppy dogs.

**Mr. Broome:** If you would spend more time in your seat this would be a different place.

**Mr. Howard:** I do not want to get into exchanging remarks of this type across the floor. The point that is being proved here is that this man had domicile in Montreal in the province of Quebec and has never moved out of that province. Therefore the matter is properly before us because sometimes there may be conflict with respect to whether or not there is jurisdiction to deal with a particular case. Then there are some events leading up to the allegation of adultery which