Hon. Mr. DICKEY thought it might admit of doubt whether it would be advisable to make this change. As to the matter of uniformity, there was a perfect want of uniformity in the circumstances attending those cases—private bills and divorces. This Legislature was the only tribunal to which people could resort for divorce under circumstances which all justified. And rules were made for the poor as well as for the rich, and it was very hard to impose on a man who might not be able to pay $100, the fee of $200. In many cases it might not merely prove an objection, but a denial of justice. In these cases, the House sat, not so much as a legislature, as a judicial body, and they would be taxing the boon of justice by imposing the additional penalty. He assumed, in this connection, that they were all agreed, whatever their private opinions might be as to the propriety or impropriety of divorce, that they should not import this matter into the present discussion. He trusted that no sympathies, one way or the other, would induce members to throw any additional embarrassment in the way of obtaining what the laws allowed. Existing preliminaries were sufficiently onerous to petitioners for divorce, including the printing of 750 copies of the bill, the employment of counsel, the bringing here of witnesses, in some cases from remote corners of the Dominion. In addition, comes this deposit of $100, which was simply to re-imburse the Senate for expenses that did not come under any of the categories mentioned. Hitherto, $100 had been found amply sufficient for the inevitable expenses of passing a bill through the House. It was more than sufficient, and consequently, if they could only separate their minds from the question of the propriety or impropriety of divorce, he saw no reason why they should place this additional difficulty or embarrassment in the way of people seeking a constitutional remedy for, possibly, a constitutional defect. (Hear, hear, and a laugh.)

Hon. Mr. PENNY was understood to say that he quite agreed with the views of the last speaker. He thought it was a question whether they shou d obstruct divorce, because many considered them bad things in themselves. He should be disposed to go as far as anybody in this view, being much of the opinion of his Lower Canada neighbors generally, that divorces might as well be done away with altogether. That was not the question here, however They admitted there were circumstances under which they were constitutionally proper. They (the Senate) sat as a court of justice; they were not legislating, but acting as judges, and it was the first time in the history of the world that a court of justice charged for adjudicating. This House and the other took the place of courts of justice in other countries, and should, as nearly as possible, conform their proceedings to those of courts. He thought it would be a very great hardship that a poor man or woman with a grievance of the kind redressed by divorce, should be debarred from a remedy open to a rich one. He should be far more disposed, while administering this law, to take the $100 off altogether, than to add another $100. (Hear, hear.)

Hon. Mr. WILMOT said he would be glad to see the Senate relieved of the duty of acting as a court of divorce, and the sooner they established a court of divorce the better. (Hear, hear.) In the Lower Provinces they had such courts, and they existed in the mother country, and other nations also. In the meantime, he was not prepared to bar the way to suitors desiring justice in Canada, and should vote for the abolition of the $100 fee even, in place of the addition of another $100. A divorce bill was not a private bill in the ordinary sense, but involved a matter of public justice; it was, in fact, a public bill. He therefore should not impose a penalty upon parties coming here for justice.

Hon. Mr. MACPHERSON said he was quite sure that neither the hon. leader of the Government nor the hon. leader of the Opposition, considered this a party matter, affected by party discipline, (laughter), and after the expression of opinion which had taken place, he hoped the hon. gentleman would withdraw his Motion. A Bill on this particular subject was more the sentence of judges than a private bill. He thought it essentially wrong to do anything to impede the adjudication of