

him then and there, explaining to him personally the purport and exigencies thereof.

Q. Do you know the said Robt. L. Johnson and the petitioner, Marie Louise Noel?

A. I know the said Robt. L. Johnson and I know the said Marie Louise Noel. I have known the said R. L. Johnson for some years.

Q. Is the person, Robert L. Johnson upon whom you served copies of the writings, marked A and B respectively, the same Robert L. Johnson who is named in the said writings respectively, and who is therein styled the husband of the said Marie Louise Noel?

A. Yes, he is the same person.

Q. Did you compare the said duplicate copies of the writings A and B with the said writings respectively, and ascertain that they were true copies?

A. I compared carefully the said copies of the writings A and B with the said writings respectively and I ascertained that they were true copies.

HON. MR. OGILVIE moved that the witness be allowed to retire from the bar.

The motion was agreed to.

HON. MR. OGILVIE moved that the petitioner be heard at the Bar of the House if necessary.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—I do not know that that is necessary. The rule says that the petitioner shall be brought to the bar, unless the Senate thinks fit to dispense therewith.

HON. MR. POWER—I think the course which the hon. member from Alma was taking was the correct one—that the petitioner should be brought to the bar of the House and then the examination of the witness at the bar could be dispensed with.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—I must differ from my hon. friend. The rule says that the petitioner must appear, unless the House dispense with her appearance. The House may dispense with her appearance.

HON. MR. POWER—The petitioner is to appear below the Bar of the House at the second reading “to be examined by the Senate, unless the Senate thinks fit to dispense therewith.” That is the examination I presume. Whether my construction of the rule is correct or not, there can be no objection to the petitioner appearing at the Bar.

HON. MR. OGILVIE moved

That the examination of the said Petitioner at the Bar be dispensed with, but that it be an instruction to any Select Committee to whom the said Bill may be referred to examine the said Marie Louise Noel, generally.

The motion was agreed to on a division.

HON. MR. OGILVIE moved

That the Petitioner, Marie Louise Noel, being in attendance at the Bar of the Senate and ready to be examined in this matter as well generally as in regard to any collusion or connivance between the parties to obtain such separation, her examination be for the present dispensed with, but that it be an instruction to any Committee to whom the Bill on the subject may be referred to make such examination.

HON. MR. POWER—That resolution is clearly incorrect, under the present state of things, because the petitioner is not at the Bar of the House, and that resolution is based on the supposition that she is at the Bar. It shows clearly, as this resolution has been drawn up in accordance with precedents, that the petitioner should have come to the Bar, because the resolution is nonsense now. It asks that, the petitioner “being at the Bar,” her examination be dispensed with. It is not my duty to look after divorce bills, but still I think the procedure of the House should be kept correct.

The motion was agreed to on a division.

HON. MR. OGILVIE moved the second reading of the Bill.

The motion was agreed to on a division.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—There has