

Sir J. A. Macdonald thought the honourable gentleman introducing the measure ought to look into it carefully. It appeared to be a Bill affecting trade, and if such, ought to originate in resolution.

Hon. Mr. Holton thought the suggestion a good one.

Mr. Mackenzie said that it either was a measure affecting trade, and one that ought to originate in resolution, or else it was a Local Bill, which ought not to be brought into that House.

Hon. Mr. Dunkin said that a Bill like this had been before the Quebec Legislature, and had been withdrawn on account of two objections:—1st. a doubt as to the jurisdiction; 2nd. strong opposition to the provisions of the Bill. If, in the present instance, the Bill came within the jurisdiction of the House clearly, it was one of the Acts which had to originate in resolution.

The motion was carried.

The House rose at 6 o'clock.

After the recess,

CASE OF THE PROPELLER "GEORGIAN"

Mr. Morrison presented the petition of G. T. Denison, of Toronto, praying an investigation into the circumstances attending the seizure of the propeller "Georgian" by the Government in 1855.

The petition was received, and a special Committee appointed to inquire into the case, with power to send for persons and papers.

RICHELIEU AND PASUMSIC R.N.C.

Mr. Chamberlin introduced a Bill to incorporate the Richelieu and Pasumsic Railway and Navigation Co.

Mr. Workman introduced the Bill from the Senate for the relief of F. J. Whiteaves.

On the motion for its reference to a Select Committee,

Hon. Mr. Holton said he did not see why this matter of divorce had not been so arranged under Confederation that it could be dealt with by the Local Legislature. As to the Bill before the House, they were empowered to deal with it by the constitution, but he maintained that this question of divorce ought to be dealt with judicially and not by the Legislature. Until that could be done he would vote against all private Bills such as that before the House.

Mr. Mackenzie was surprised that the member for Chateauguay should declare his opposition to this the only remedy which the asking for the Bill could obtain under the law. This was the only Court in the land to relieve persons such as this man Whiteaves. Undoubtedly these Bills ought not to be encouraged except in extreme cases, but believing this to be one, he (Mr. Mackenzie) would vote for the reference.

Mr. Bellerose said that in this matter honourable gentlemen should vote according to their conscience. He would vote against the measure, believing divorce to be an unchristian practice.

Hon. Mr. Langevin took a similar view.

Hon. Mr. Chauveau—On grounds altogether independent of religious belief entertained the strongest aversion to interfering with the marriage tie, and would vote against the reference.

Hon. Mr. Dunkin would have no difficulty in voting for the Bill, if a case were made out, and in the meantime would not oppose the reference.

Hon. Mr. Anglin held that no human tribunal, civil or ecclesiastical, had a right to dissolve the marriage tie. No Act even of a Council of the Roman Catholic Church, or the Pope of the Church, had that power. Believing this, he (Mr. Anglin) would oppose this Bill or any Bill for the establishment of a Court of Divorce. In matters of this kind, Roman Catholics hold themselves absolutely bound by the decisions of their Church; and those decisions taught that mankind had no power to separate those whom God had joined together. No action of that House could sever the marriage rite. They might, by the action of the Legislature, legalize adultery; but that was all they could do. He would therefore move that the Bill be not now referred to Committee, but be referred that day three months.

Hon. Mr. Johnson objected to special legislation such as this.

Hon. Mr. Anglin then said he would withdraw his amendment, as since putting it, he had ascertained that a vote on the original motion would answer the purpose as well.

The House then divided on the original motion, which was carried. Yeas, 78; Nays, 57.