

HON. MR. GIRARD—I should like an explanation as to whether the offence provided for in this Bill is condoned by marriage?

HON. MR. HOWLAN—We have had no explanation from the promoter of this Bill as to the real necessity for it. We have no proof that the Minister of Justice who has control of the criminal jurisprudence of the country has had this Bill submitted to him for his approval; and certainly we have had no explanation from the promoter in this House to show the reason why we should alter the determination we arrived at last Session. Further, I think the Bill is hardly in a position to receive the careful consideration of the members of this House, when I find that the copy in our hands is not like the one from which my hon. friend has quoted. Under all the circumstances it would be better for my hon. friend to postpone the second reading to another day.

HON. MR. ALMON—I am not astonished that there are no copies of this Bill to be had. I think the society for preventing the spread of vice must have suppressed them all. They were so disgustingly obscene that the same law which prevents the importation of Zola's novels as obscene literature should have prevented its introduction into Parliament. I compliment the hon. member on the decency of his Bill. It is a different measure from the one brought before us last year which provided that a boy of fourteen should not have connection with his grandmother.

It was a disgusting bill which should never have been brought before this House. I compliment the hon. gentleman from Sarnia on the decency of this Bill, and I shall be very happy to vote for it.

HON. MR. SCOTT—I should like to say in reply to the question of the hon. gentleman from St Boniface that the offence provided for is only a misdemeanor and would be condoned by marriage.

The motion was agreed to and the Bill was read the second time.

THE NOEL DIVORCE BILL.

REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE.

The Order of the Day being called for the consideration of the Report of the Select Committee to whom was referred the Bill intituled "An Act for the Relief of Marie Louise Noel,"

HON. MR. KAULBACH said—I think my hon. friend will consent that the report of the Committee be postponed as the evidence is not yet printed, and it would be very unseemly for us to consider the Bill without having the evidence before us. In a matter of such importance as this, we ought not to deal with it without due consideration. It is a ground of reproach to the United States that divorce is granted there very lightly, and I consider it would be most unseemly if we should pass judgment on this Bill without having the evidence before us.

HON. MR. OGILVIE—I was about to move the consideration of the report, not the adoption of the report, but my hon. friend from Lunenburg has taken the whole work out of my hands, for he is finding fault with what I have not done at all. I am pleased to have the opportunity in bringing this report before the House of telling the hon. gentleman or the Hon. Speaker and whoever is interested, that if something is not done at once about our printing we are likely not only to be able to adjourn for a week or two, but for a month or two; for it appears that matter stands in the hands of a printer for days and days without being touched. The evidence in this case was to have been printed last Friday, and it is not before us yet. We can get nothing done, and if our work is to lie behind in this way day after day and week after week something must be done to remedy it. I was going to move the consideration of the report simply for the sake of facilitating business, but my hon. friend from Lunenburg need not be afraid for a moment that I was going to ask to have it hurried through or forced through without every gentleman having an opportunity of considering the evidence. I did think that in moving the