

Niagara Falls Memorial Bridge

through its parks commission, is applying for the incorporation of a company of its own to deal with a bridge in that locality. This bill gives incorporation to the company and parliament has to deal with it because it happens to be an international waterway which is to be crossed. I understood that the hon. member for Lincoln, who is on the parks board, has certain observations to make to this house with respect to this bill, but due to a bereavement in his family he is absent at a time when he expected to be here. I have not discussed this matter with the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Pettit) and I have had no communication with the hon. member for Lincoln, but in view of the fact that the state of New York and the province of Ontario, the two communities affected, are both opposed to this legislation, it would seem to me that an opportunity should be afforded to the representative who happens to be on the parks board, and who is looked to to present their views to this house, to put his case before the committee. It will be a matter of more than passing curiosity why this parliament gives incorporation to a company which is not desired by either the state of New York or the province of Ontario.

Mr. YOUNG (Saskatoon): As the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Bennett) has said, a telegram was sent to the Prime Minister of Canada by the Premier of Ontario. This telegram was placed in the hands of the chairman of the railway committee, and he handed it to me, as I was then acting as chairman. The telegram was read before the committee when the hon. member for Lincoln was present, and it was fully discussed. Several amendments were introduced which I understood very largely met the objections raised by the hon. member.

Mr. BENNETT: Am I right in believing that an advertisement is pending for a bill on behalf of the parks commission itself to construct a bridge across this waterway?

I think hon. gentlemen will find that such is the case; that the province of Ontario is now advertising in the Gazette and in the newspapers asking for a bill such as this. I am only giving my recollection of what was said by one of the gentlemen from that department.

Mr. SPENCER: I have seen the advertisements.

Mr. LAPOINTE: It is rather late for a private bill.

Mr. BENNETT: They were trying to get it through this session.

[Mr. Bennett.]

The CHAIRMAN: It is for the committee to decide whether or not we shall proceed with the bill. We are now on section 6. Shall section 6 carry?

Section agreed to.

Sections 7, 8 and 9 agreed to.

On section 10—Tolls.

Mr. DUNNING: Was this section amended in committee?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, in line 17 the words "governor in council" have been struck out and the words "Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada" have been substituted therefor.

Section as amended agreed to.

Section 11 agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN: Sections 12 and 13 have been stricken out.

Sections 14 to 20 inclusive agreed to.

Bill reported on division.

FLORENCE MAY FORBES

The house in committee on Bill No. 122 for the relief of Florence May Forbes.—Mr. Bell (Hamilton)—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

On section 1—Marriage dissolved.

Mr. SPENCER: Would the sponsor of the bill inform the committee whether there are any children in this case?

Mr. BELL (Hamilton): If my hon. friend will refer to the former proceedings, he will see that it was explained that the respondent had become a fugitive from justice two or three years before this unfortunate woman petitioned; that one of the children remained with her, and that two others were being cared for by relatives in England.

Mr. BOURASSA: It has been frequently said that parliament does not encourage divorce by collusion. This is supposed to be the rule. In the senate committee there is put to every petitioner for divorce a formal, what I might call a stereotyped, question to which the invariable answer "no" is given. Of course, if one reads the evidence in most of the bills, it is quite apparent that although there is not actual and absolute collusion, the party against whom the divorce is asked has generally placed himself or herself in such a position that the evidence will enable the committee of the senate to declare that adultery has been proven. That is quite clear from the evidence in most of the bills, but