

down. I knew what it was to be a strong Liberal thirty years ago, and to have the fulminations of the church against me. I remember when the people were asked to vote against me because I took a certain stand on the Manitoba School Bill. I know what it was to be denounced from the pulpit twenty-five years ago, because I stood up for home rule. I have gone through all that fire, have stood it all, and the causes for which I worked are triumphant and I am still alive. The home rule cause, which was then looked upon with suspicions, is to-day triumphant, and has become a plank in the platform of the Liberal party and is the policy of the young men of the empire. When I am told that I have taken up this matter for the sake of the clergy, hon. gentlemen do me a grievous injustice. I am acting in the interests of my country and of the people I am supposed to represent here. That is why I introduced a Bill to restrict the evils of divorce, and I am happy to say it was only lost by a majority of one. Later on I shall, if possible, present a Bill along the same lines, whereby all persons divorced and who were the cause of the divorce by their own evil conduct shall not have the privilege of remarrying in Canada, and if they remarry outside the limits of Canada, they shall not have the right to come back here without rendering themselves liable to arrest for bigamy. I am led to take that action from what I have been reading lately. Here is a paragraph from the Montreal 'Star' of May 23:

New Brunswick divorces.—Several sensational cases have been instituted.

(Special to the Montreal 'Star'.)

Fredericton, New Brunswick, May 22.—Some sensational divorce cases, in which the principals include residents of both Moncton and St. Stephen who are prominent in the upper social set, as well as in business circles, have been instituted in the court of the province.

One of the cases is that of Madeline Whitlock vs. Julius T. Whitlock, of St. Stephen. Her husband is cashier of the St. Stephen Bank, and ex-mayor of St. Stephen.

Mrs. Madeline Douglas Edith Clark asks for separation, a mensa et thoro, from her husband, Robert Clark. Mrs. Clark is a niece of the late Sir Alexander Gault, of Montreal, while her husband is the manager of the Bank of Montreal.

Dr. William A. Ferguson, of Moncton, is asking for an absolute divorce from his wife Bertha.

Hon. Mr. CLORAN.

Edward A. Harris, of Moncton, is asking for an absolute divorce from his wife, Beulah Longfellow. Mr. Harris is a member of one of the best families in Moncton, and his wife is a daughter of P. S. Archibald, one of the commissioners of the Central Railway, being a member of a highly respected family.

Hon. Mr. DOMVILLE—What has New Brunswick got to do with this case?

Hon. Mr. CLORAN—I am discussing the divorce question, and I say it is my intention to introduce a Bill to restrict the evils of divorce as far as it is possible to do so by our legislation. I find it is necessary to introduce it under the Criminal Code to protect society against the decisions of courts, so that the court in any province where they have the right to grant divorce shall not have the right to give both parties, the innocent and the guilty alike, the privilege of re-marrying. Here are several cases on one day in New Brunswick, not ordinary people, but people who are supposed to set an example to the rest of society, who are seeking divorce. What are the ordinary classes of society to do when they see such a formidable number of the leading people, who should be examples to their fellowmen, taking such a step? And now I come to the last argument that I have to offer. I want to read a telegram relating to a recent divorce case in the United States. It is as follows:—

Mrs. Alfred Vanderbilt's divorce.

New York, May 25.—Mrs. Ellen French Vanderbilt was granted an interlocutory decree of divorce from Alfred Gwynne Vanderbilt by Justice O'Gorman in the Supreme Court to-day on the report of David McClure, the referee, who was appointed to take testimony and determine the findings in the suit instituted by Mrs. Vanderbilt. Justice O'Gorman confirmed the report of the referee that Mr. Vanderbilt had been guilty of misconduct and directed that Mrs. Vanderbilt be granted a judgment of absolute divorce.

The divorce decree provides that Mrs. Vanderbilt may marry during the lifetime of Mr. Vanderbilt, but prevents him from marrying during her lifetime. The custody of Wm. H. Vanderbilt, the only child of the marriage, was awarded to Mrs. Vanderbilt. No provision was made for alimony in the decree, nor was the subject alluded to in the report of Referee McClure.

Now, here is a step identical with the one I asked this House to take. Here is one of the judges of the United States taking upon himself to prevent the guilty party