

of Albert Edwin Gordon," and the proposed motion of Mr. Steele in amendment thereto (resumed from September 7.)

Mr. HUGH GUTHRIE (South Wellington): Mr. Speaker, I was addressing the Chair when the hour for Private Bills expired on the 7th September. I wish merely to add that I think every member has received a complete copy of the evidence. Having gone over the matter with some care, and having given it the best consideration I am able to bestow on it, I feel that my vote in the committee was fully justified by the evidence. I think the respondent has been guilty of such conduct as to entitle her husband to the divorce asked for. I think, on the other hand, there has been no evidence of condonation on the part of the husband sufficient to deprive him of the relief he now seeks. During the married life of these parties there have no doubt been occasions when both have been more or less blameworthy. But the acts of adultery charged against the wife in these proceedings all took place after a separation which had been agreed upon between the parties. I have no hesitation in coming to the conclusion that this petitioner is entitled to the relief which he asks.

The adoption of the amendment, which proposes to refer the Bill back to the Private Bills Committee for further consideration, would probably result in killing the Bill for this session. This unfortunate petitioner had a Bill before Parliament in 1915, but the time elapsed and no conclusion was to come to. He came again this year in good time—the evidence was taken in the Senate in June—and it would be a grave hardship if the House did not take some action on it at this time, instead of referring it back to the committee, which will probably not meet again during the present session.

Amendment (Mr. Steele) declared lost on the following division:

YEAS.

Messieurs:

Armstrong (Lambton),	Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Bennett (Simcoe),	Lewis,
Boivin,	McKenzie,
Copp,	Morphy,
Currie,	Morris,
Doherty,	Morrison,
Donaldson,	Nicholson,
Gauvreau,	Oliver,
Graham,	Papineau,
Hart,	Robidoux,
Hughes	Sexsmith,
(Kings, P.E.I.),	Shepherd,
Hughes (Sir Sam),	Steele,
Kyte,	Taylor.—28.
Lapointe	
(Kamouraska),	

NAYS.

Messieurs:

Bennett (Calgary),	Maclean (Halifax),
Borden (Sir Robert),	McCurdy,
Boyce,	McLean
Boys,	(Queens, P.E.I.),
Burrell,	Meighen,
Carvell,	Northrup,
Charlton,	Pugsley,
Clark (Bruce),	Reid,
Clark (Red Deer),	Roche,
Cockshutt,	Rogers,
Crothers,	Smith,
Davidson,	Stewart (Lunenburg),
Foster (Sir George),	Thoburn,
Glass,	Tremain,
Guthrie,	Turriff,
Henderson,	Wallace,
Kay,	Weichel,
Kemp (Sir Edward),	Wilson (Wentworth).
Loggie,	—37.
Macdonald,	

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is on the main motion.

Mr. CARVELL: Before this vote is taken, I want to point out the unfortunate position in which I find myself with regard to this Bill. I do not know whether I ought to vote or not, but I desire to show the utter absolute nonsense of granting divorces by the Parliament of Canada—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. CARVELL: —and the necessity of having a divorce court, if divorces are to be granted. I suppose that I am to blame in this matter. I should have taken the trouble to read the evidence, but I am pretty busy, and I have not had the time to read it. I am asked to sit here as a judge, and render a decision on such a serious matter as dissolving the marriage contract between man and wife, and I have to do that without the faintest knowledge in the world as to what I am doing. All I can do is to accept the judgment of those who have dealt with the case. I understand the Bill has received the endorsement of the committee of the Senate and the committee of the House of Commons. I presume they have gone over the evidence. I must take it for granted that these committees have given the case their best consideration and while I understand these committees were pretty nearly evenly divided, yet the majority in both committees decided in favour of granting divorce, and all I can do is to accept the decision of the majority of those committees, and vote accordingly, or else retire from the Chamber. I take this occasion to point out the absurdity of the whole proposition.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: My hon. friend is aware that a joint committee of the Senate and House of Commons is endeavouring