

## Private Bills

**Miss Aitken:** Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is just as the preamble states, to incorporate the Canadian women's press club so as to give statutory recognition to something that has been in existence for 54 years. The Canadian women's press club was formed in 1904. I think there were 14 members originally and there are now 600 with 15 branches across Canada. They simply want parliament to allow them to incorporate.

**Mr. Martin (Essex East):** Of course I know the answer to this question but others may want to know if there are any male members of this organization.

**Miss Aitken:** No, there are not.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to the standing committee on miscellaneous private bills.

## WILLIAM HARRISON TERRY

**Mr. Speaker:** The third item mentioned to me is the last item under the heading of private bills, order No. 124, consideration of Bill No. SD-199, an act for the relief of William Harrison Terry. Has the hon. member for Winnipeg South leave to move a motion?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Peters:** Mr. Speaker, before we give agreement I should like to ask if this bill is being sent back to the committee with instructions to hear further evidence in this particular case.

**Mr. Chown:** The motion I have worded is explanatory in that respect. I move, seconded by the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mr. Browe):

That Bill No. SD-199 entitled "an act for the relief of William Harrison Terry", be recommitted to the standing committee on miscellaneous private bills for the purpose of hearing evidence.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is the house agreed that this motion may be moved now by unanimous consent?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

## KALJO KLASMAN

The house in committee on Bill No. SD-129, for the relief of Kaljo Klasman—Mr. McCleave—Mr. Rea in the chair.

On clause 1—*Marriage dissolved.*

**Mr. Peters:** Mr. Chairman, on many occasions the house has been most concerned about the method followed in these proceedings and the form of evidence presented in some divorce cases. This case is a contested case, and in my opinion it has been presented

very strongly and defended very poorly. It is a contradiction of another case we have been discussing which was presented very poorly and defended very strongly. The case received considerable attention in the committee and in looking over the evidence it is my opinion that we are asked to stretch the bounds of credulity too far when we are asked to rule that adultery was committed.

There are a number of things that are odd about this case and I should like to refer to some of them. One of them is the evidence given by the co-respondent. The second is the evidence given by two witnesses, Mr. and Mrs. Fournier. Mr. and Mrs. Fournier claimed and repeated in the evidence on a number of occasions that they were very close friends of the defendant. They pointed out that they had known Mrs. Klasman for some length of time. It was pointed out that Mrs. Fournier and Mrs. Klasman were very close friends but when subpoenas were issued to Mr. and Mrs. Fournier they presented themselves with no apparent reluctance and testified in a manner which in my opinion is not in keeping with close friendship.

The evidence points out a number of things. First, we should point out that there were two alleged acts of adultery and one of them, not being proven before the Senate, was dropped by agreement. They proceeded with the second charge. In this particular case the story is that the lady went to this party at the Fournier's establishment. Mr. Umblia came to that party later. After considerable drinking, Mr. Umblia and Mrs. Klasman left the party. The next morning Mr. and Mrs. Fournier drove to Mrs. Klasman's house where they were to pick the people up to go for an outing that day. At that time Mrs. Fournier knew where Mrs. Klasman lived. They drove to that address but Mrs. Klasman was not there.

It seems significant that Mr. Fournier testified that he did not know where Mr. Umblia lived but Mrs. Fournier was quite familiar with the address. They went to that address. It was not proven by Mr. Fournier, but only by Mr. Umblia and other witnesses, that they ever arrived at the Umblia apartment. When they arrived there Mr. Umblia, according to the evidence on page 25, said he had been drinking a great deal. He was asked when he arrived at the Fournier's apartment and he said about midnight, but then he added, "I don't remember".

Mr. Umblia testified he had been drinking very heavily on the night in question. Mrs. Fournier testified that when she arrived at that apartment Mrs. Klasman was not fully dressed, to the extent she did not have her shoes on. Mr. Umblia was asked how he was