

of Mr. McKay be substituted for that of Mr. McClelan on the committee.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—Much as I may agree with my hon. friend from British Columbia in the remarks he has made, I think this is not an opportune occasion to discuss the large question which he has raised. I rise more particularly to speak of the *personnel* of the committee. On a matter of such grave character as this, affecting the sacred tie of marriage, I consider that the committee should be selected apart from provincialism altogether. We should have the very best qualified minds in the House, regardless of what locality they may come from. I have been a member of Divorce Committees in this House for a number of years—I believe ever since I first had a seat here some twenty years ago—and there was a member of the Senate, who was most conspicuous on all the committees, in whom I placed the greatest confidence—I refer to the hon. member from Amherst. His impartiality, his knowledge and his courtesy were always remarkable, and on the committee conspicuously so. I much regret that his name does not appear on this committee, and I do not believe that it will be as good a committee as it would be if his name were included. In dealing with the important matters which are to come before us I would much prefer that I should be taken off that committee and my hon. friend from Amherst placed on it. I consider that without him on the committee the same confidence cannot be placed in its reports that there would be if he were a member of it. I do not make an objection to any individual member of the committee, but feeling, as I strongly do, that my hon. friend's name should be added, I should certainly make a place for him if my name on it would have the effect of preventing him having a place on the committee.

HON. MR. DICKEY—My hon. friend has made a very kind allusion to me personally, for which I am duly grateful. I am bound to say, in justice to the Government, that my exclusion from the committee was made at my own desire. I need not go now into the reasons for the course which I took in that respect; I simply rise for the purpose of removing any impression from my hon. friend's

mind that the exclusion was in any way intended, so far as I know, to reflect upon myself. I acquit the Government of that entirely, for I took the full responsibility of asking that my name should be put off. I may be pardoned for adverting for a moment to the remarks made by my hon. friend from British Columbia. Last session I placed my convictions on that subject on record. I went so far as to state that unless something was done about it during the present session I should feel it my duty to suggest that we bring in a measure for the purpose of carrying out the views of my hon. friend from British Columbia, with which I fully sympathize; but I feel on the present occasion that, without reflecting on my hon. friend for the course he has taken, it would be, perhaps, premature on my part to take the present occasion to express my views. A discussion would come more properly and appropriately in the form of a substantive motion, so as to command the proper consideration of the House. At the same time, I think my hon. friend's remarks are entitled to careful consideration by the leader of the Government and by this House. I therefore will not enter into the subject at all, and for this additional reason, that during the present session, at all events, we must act under the system that we have, and that any measure that may be passed must necessarily be prospective. Under those circumstances, any remarks of mine would be, perhaps, out of place—at all events, they would be unnecessary. It will be quite time to give my views on the subject when it comes properly before us. In any legislation of this kind, which would impose a charge, possibly, upon the revenue of the country, I think it is quite right that the measure should be initiated by the Government. For those reasons, I am not prepared to say anything further on the subject now.

HON. MR. SUTHERLAND—I wish to express my sympathy with the views of my hon. friend from British Columbia. I have sat on Divorce Committees for some fifteen or sixteen years. I have no reflections to cast on my colleagues in those committees; I think they did their duty faithfully, but I concur in the opinion that there should be some other tribunal to deal with divorce, for the simple reason that it is no easy matter for people who live 800 or