

A great disadvantage of parliamentary divorce is the length of time it takes, due to the infrequency of the sittings and the necessity of advertising for 14 weeks. Some try to argue that this will prevent rash action; that it will provide time to repent and to reconsider. To this, the answer is that the possibility of reconciliation in divorce cases must from their very nature and from the publicity afforded to them by the necessary advertising be almost negligible. There is also the further and even more practical answer that in many cases this delay is an absolute hardship—the temperamental hardship of being tied to an undesirable union, and in the case of the poor of being unable to marry a desirable helpmate as soon as might otherwise be possible.

Probably the greatest disadvantage of the parliamentary system is the absolute disadvantage, amounting in many cases to prohibition, at which the poor are placed. It means the taking of counsel and witnesses long distances, their maintenance while attending in Ottawa, and the expenditure of \$210 alone on parliamentary, and practically useless, printing. As stated by the British Commission in another connection, it is obviously unsatisfactory that, while Courts have been established in which the poor can sue and be sued in respect of small debts and torts and compensation for injuries, they should have no means of redress in these graver matters. The matters which are recognised as grounds for divorce are recognised as intolerable, and yet the remedy is placed beyond the reach of those who need to use it. The latter if too poor to invoke the assistance of Parliament must either take the law into their own hands and live immoral lives, or submit to hardships which the same Parliament has itself recognised as intolerable. It is argued that the poor can never be placed before the law in the same position as the rich! true poor people have to be content with less expensive litigation, generally in the way of counsel; but none the less the State should provide tribunals suitable to their means. This is done in respect of all litigation except divorce. Also the need of the poor for divorce is greater even than the rich. The latter have far more power than the former of mitigating the hardships and miseries consequent on the destruction of the home. The Registrar of the Supreme Court at Victoria gives as his estimate of the total costs in an undefended action before that Court \$240; for Nova Scotia a similar estimate is made at \$150; for New Brunswick, the estimate covers only Court costs, and is \$30.