

Saskatchewan...	1	judge to	63,126	persons
Alberta.....	1	"	53,496	"
Yukon.....	1	"	4,157	"
3. 18 chief justices, \$10,000 each.				
112 puisne judges, \$9,000 each.				
4. Ontario.....			65	
Québec.....			0	
Nova Scotia.....			7	
New Brunswick..			6	
Manitoba.....			10	
British Columbia..			14	
Prince Edward Island..			3	
Saskatchewan.....			18	
Alberta.....			12	
Yukon.....			0	

5. Calculated on Census of 1921:

Ontario.....	1	judge to	45,134	persons
*Quebec.....	1	"	590,299	"
Nova Scotia.....	1	"	74,834	"
New Brunswick..	1	"	64,649	"
Manitoba.....	1	"	61,012	"
British Columbia..	1	"	37,489	"
Prince Edward Island..	1	"	29,538	"
Saskatchewan.....	1	"	42,084	"
Alberta.....	1	"	49,038	"
Yukon.....	none			

*The only judges in Quebec coming under this question are the 4 judges of the Circuit Court of Montreal.

6. The intention of the Government will be disclosed in due course.

7. No.

8 and 9. These are included in reply to No. 1.

ACCOMMODATION IN THE SENATE CHAMBER

MOTION

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND moved:

That a Select Committee be appointed to consider the possibility of enlarging the galleries of the Senate, as was suggested at the last session of Parliament.

That this Committee be composed of the Honourable the Speaker and the Honourable Messieurs Beaubien, Belcourt, Hardy, Macdonell, McDougald, McMeans and White (Inkerman).

The motion was agreed to.

DIVORCE BILL (ONTARIO)

THIRD READING POSTPONED

Hon. Mr. WILLOUGHBY moved the third reading of Bill A, an Act to provide in the Province of Ontario for the dissolution and the annulment of marriage.

Hon. N. A. BELCOURT: Honourable gentlemen, when a Bill somewhat similar to this was before us for consideration a couple of years ago, I took part in the discussion and dealt with it purely and exclusively from the point of view of natural and civil law. At that time I carefully abstained from obtruding religious or sentimental views of any kind, and on this occasion I intend to confine myself in the same manner.

I may at once say that I am not labouring under any delusion that the observations which I am about to offer are going to make

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND.

one single convert to my view in this House. If that were my purpose in making these observations, I would not make them at all; but I think it my duty to do so, not because of the convictions which I hold—convictions which I know are shared by a great many honourable gentlemen who are not Roman Catholics, who sit with me in this House. I think practically all Catholics of Canada, whether Roman or Anglican, share with me the views that I hold upon this subject.

In order that my observations may be as brief as possible and that I may not weary the House, I have reduced to writing my views from the legal aspect, and with the permission of the House I will read this epitome of what seem to me to be the principles which must govern the matter of divorce.

Before reading this summary I desire to point out that there is apparently no demand for this legislation. The public press has not mentioned the subject at all. We have no way of ascertaining what is the public opinion in the province of Ontario, to which this Bill will exclusively apply. Whether a Bill of this kind is desired or not is a matter of mere guesswork. I had expected that the opinion of the province would have been ascertained through the Attorney General, who would have been in a position, to a certain degree at all events, to let this House know just what is the state of public opinion or public feeling in Ontario with regard to this jurisdiction being conferred on our provincial courts. I am sorry that nothing of that kind has been done. It might have served as a guide to myself and to others.

This is the resumé. I desire to read it, because I think every word counts, and I could not be very sure of giving every word from memory.

There is no obligation on the part of Parliament under the B.N.A. Act to hear or grant applications for divorce, or to confer such jurisdiction on the courts.

May I interpolate here that I quite understand the attitude of the honourable gentlemen who sit on the Divorce Committee, and I heartily sympathize with their desire to get rid of the business of hearing applications for divorce. I do not think that is the proper function of this Legislature or any other, and I am sorry that my attitude must be in opposition to the legitimate desire of honourable senators to be relieved of the necessity of giving so much time to the hearing of divorce evidence. I can imagine how wearisome and uninteresting the duties of a member of the Divorce Committee must be