

matters specially placed within its jurisdiction. This House was a court, for cases that could not be tried anywhere else, and he thought they should not bar the entrance to this court, no matter how much some individuals might be opposed to divorce. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. ALLAN was understood to say that he heartily echoed the wish of the hon. gentleman opposite (Hon. Mr. Wilmot) that this matter was taken out of the jurisdiction of this House, for a more disagreeable or odious duty could not possibly be imposed on hon. members, than dealing with it. He believed strongly that it was not desirable either to increase the facilities or give greater opportunities to applicants for divorce on light or trivial grounds. He would rather surround divorce with greater difficulties than remove those existing. He had no desire to see in Canada the spectacle exhibited in some of the neighboring States: divorces obtained on the most trivial pretences, without any regard to the sacred nature or obligations of the marriage tie. He would prefer the adoption of the Motion.

HON. MR. SIMPSON said he was willing to grant aggrieved persons the opportunity of obtaining a severance from unworthy partners; yet, he did think they should not open the door too wide. He hoped some legal gentleman would frame a law on the subject, and he believed Government would accept one, to take this matter out of this Chamber, and relieve it of all those petty annoying divorce cases. He would support the Motion, and he thought even one that would raise the fee to \$500. He believed that in the case he had represented here, he was most egregiously deceived: that the complainant was more to blame than the other party. His impression was that they were as well entitled to pay as the judges, or that the country was entitled to some acknowledgment of the Senate's services.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL said, the object for which the deposit was required was defined in one of the clauses of the rules covering private bills, viz.: That the expense ought not to fall on the public. He thought that the costs of a divorce bill ought not to be defray-

ed by the public, but by those seeking the relief. (Hear, hear.) The time occupied with one of those bills was very considerable, much more than that spent on a private bill. The latter might be disposed of in a few hours, a divorce bill generally occupying days. He could not see that he should be doing anything inconsistent with the rule in saying those divorce bills should pay a sum at all events equal to that charged for private bills. As to not shutting the doors of Parliament against any class of claimants, those who came for those bills would enter a divorce court, though some were so poor that they would not go into such a court even were it in their own Province. Now, suitors in a court would not, he thought, obtain relief for a less sum than \$200. He apprehended they would pay as much, or more, in a court. In cases of poverty, the fact could be stated in the petitions, and relief afforded, as in the House of Lords when it had similar jurisdiction. To prevent the expense of this relief falling on the public, he thought the Motion advisable, and it was not wholesome or consistent with the weal of the country to enlarge the class of cases which would come here for this kind of relief. They did not want to move a step towards the light in which these matters were viewed in the United States, nor towards the manner of affording relief there. He thought they would be acting fairly and leniently, in imposing a fee to indemnify the public for the costs occasioned by such bills. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. KAULBACH could not concur in the remarks of the last speaker. A petitioner came to have a wrong redressed, and that under the most humiliating circumstances; by asking him to come in *formâ pauperis* they would be aggravating his sufferings. The wrong complained of was a moral wrong, a wrong to the community, a case in which a man should have the same redress as in a civil action. Here it was proposed to make a distinction between the poor man and the rich. (Hear, hear.) If they deprived a man of redress, he might seek a summary mode. He regretted those cases came before us at all, but as it was in Committee the expense