

*Private Bills—Divorce*

me, and which I think should go on the record this day. I had intended to bring them before the house on a notice of motion standing in the name of the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Cleaver). The reason I think they should go on the record this day is that I fear any statement, whether right or wrong, if made sufficiently often without contradiction is likely to be accepted in time as correct. A statement which is being made quite often in this house is that we have a moral right in so far as these private bills are concerned not to come to any conclusion on second reading until the evidence is before us.

Some days back, Mr. Speaker, you pointed out to us that the practice of this house has always been the reverse, and there can be no evidence other than what we get second-hand from the other place until after a private bill passes second reading. This is not said in a personal way, but I do not recall whether or not the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar was in his seat some days ago when we passed Bill No. 62, a private bill, without anyone raising his voice and without there being one bit of evidence before the house on which members should have adopted the motion for second reading. It happened to be an incorporation bill. What difference does it make to the practice, which is the thing to which I am trying to confine my remarks?

**Mr. Coldwell:** Will the hon. member permit a question? Bill No. 62 to which he refers surely did not involve the guilt or innocence of any particular person.

**Mr. Applewhaite:** If the hon. member will restrain himself for just a moment I shall come to that. I am not trying to force any divorce procedure on this house. I am trying to straighten out what I say, humbly but with respect, is in connection with private bills a false or wrong practice which is going to grow up in this house.

The bill to which I was referring was a bill upon which this house will eventually be asked to decide whether certain people justify incorporation. We passed that and we said if they could justify it we have no objection. Then Your Honour referred the bill to a committee to find out whether they could justify it. Under these circumstances, we do not divorce a couple at this stage. We say that if one of the parties is guilty we believe they should be divorced. Then Your Honour says that the bill will be referred to a committee, and it is the responsibility of that committee to ascertain whether or not the one party is guilty of the offence charged. If that is not the case, then it is an absolute farce, and I say this with respect, for this house to refer the matter to a committee. If

[Mr. Applewhaite.]

we are going to insist on the final evidence being before us at this stage upon which we can make a decision, I would ask what are we going to do with a private bill which originates in this house, which had not gone before any Senate committee and for which there will not even be secondhand evidence available for us to discuss.

The house divided on the motion (Mr. Winkler) which was agreed to on the following division:

## YEAS

## Messrs:

Abbott	Macdonald (Edmonton East)
Anderson	MacDougall
Applewhaite	MacKenzie
Balcom	MacLean (Cape Breton North and Victoria)
Bater	McCubbin
Benidickson	McCulloch
Bennett	McDonald (Parry Sound-Muskoka)
Bradley	McIvor
Brown (Essex West)	McLean (Huron-Perth)
Cavers	McMillan
Corry	McWilliam
Dewar	Murray (Cariboo)
Eyre	Prudham
Ferrie	Stick
Garland	Stuart (Charlotte)
George	Ward
Gibson	Weaver
Gregg	Weir
Harris (Grey-Bruce)	Welbourn
Helme	Whiteside
Huffman	Winkler
Kirk (Antigonish-Guysborough)	Wood—45.
Larson	

## NAYS

## Messrs:

Argue	Herridge
Aylesworth	Higgins
Balcer	Hodgson
Beaudoin	Jones
Blackmore	Knight
Browne (St. John's West)	Knowles
Bryce	Low
Catherwood	Macdonnell (Greenwood)
Charlton	MacLean (Queens)
Cloutier	McLure
Coldwell	Quelch
Dinsdale	Stewart (Winnipeg North)
Fair	Thomas
Graydon	Tustin
Hansell	Wright
Hees	Wylie—32.

Bill read the second time and referred to the standing committee on miscellaneous private bills.

## DOROTHY GERTRUDE FRENCH GORRELL

**Mr. H. W. Winkler (Lisgar)** moved the second reading of Bill No. 29, for the relief of Dorothy Gertrude French Gorrell.

**Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** This is a case in connection with which the printed evidence has been distributed. There are aspects about the case,