

4th. Declaration of Mr. Gray, Presbyterian clergyman at Sterling, Ontario, of his consulting with the mother of Respondent's second wife and ascertaining that Respondent had at last accounts resided at West Midford.

5th. Declaration of said Mr. Gray that he had served a copy of the notice of application upon the mother of Respondent's second wife.

6th. Declaration of A. Laverdure that he has served copy of notice of application upon the uncle of Respondent.

7th. Declaration of F. R. Marceau that he has mailed copy of notice to Respondent at his last known place of residence.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—Are the affidavits all in the hands of the Clerk that are referred to in your memorandum?

HON. MR. OGILVIE—They are.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—Then they should be read.

HON. MR. DICKEY—The only evidence we have had read is a declaration to show that service was attempted by a letter addressed through the Post Office to a person in Boston and another part of the United States. My hon. friend who has charge of this matter has read a statement as to other efforts besides those two to obtain personal service, and when that evidence is produced it leaves the House to decide whether it is sufficient under rule 73. We have proof of a letter being mailed to a place which is supposed to be the last residence of the Respondent, and we have heard no proof yet as to the other attempts to make service. My hon. friend has mentioned a great many attempts, but I have not heard any affidavit or any declaration under the statute that those attempts were made. That is a point on which I wish to ask the opinion of the House, and to which I call the attention of my hon. friend who has charge of the petition.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—I think the affidavits are on the table of the House.

HON. MR. OGILVIE—I stated in the beginning that I had all the affidavits here and sent them up to the Clerk.

Everything that possibly could be done has been done, and there are seven affidavits there to prove it.

HON. MR. MILLER—The House will recollect this is a serious judicial investigation, and we are to be governed as much as possible by the rules and practice that obtain in the courts of law in taking evidence. We are not in possession of the facts to be considered and acted upon in order to allow this motion to prevail. We have not the evidence before us in a proper legal shape. We have the statement of the hon. gentleman as to that evidence, which I have no doubt is correct, but there is only one way in which the House can receive the statement as fact, and that is by reading the affidavits and declarations on which the statement is founded. It is a very solemn judicial matter in which we are engaged, and I think all the forms which the rules of Parliament have thrown round the proceedings in divorce cases should be strictly adhered to. I was reluctant to rise sooner to make any observations in opposition to the reading of the petition, but as the evidence is now before me I am prepared to vote for the reading of the petition if it is satisfactory. My reason for desiring not to make any observations in opposition is this; it is known that I, in common with a large number of gentlemen in this House, entertain a peculiar and certain opinion on questions of divorce. I am hostile to divorce cases from whatever cause they originate, consequently I would prefer to leave the discussion of the legal points involved to gentlemen of the legal profession who believe those matters are proper subjects of investigation before the Senate.

HON. MR. GOWAN—I quite agree with the hon. gentleman, but I have had occasion to look over some of the affidavits that have not been read as yet. I notice that the hon. gentleman who has the matter in charge very correctly gave the substance of each, and as I understand from him that all those papers are now in the hands of the Clerk, they certainly should be read. With regard to the inability to make personal service, so far as I know