

could not be great. He hoped some means would soon be devised for relieving us of those cases. While it was not furnished, he thought it was their duty to leave the door open to the existing redress.

HON. MR. MILLER thought it would be as well for honorable gentlemen who spoke of the establishment of a divorce court in the Dominion to reflect that there might exist very grave doubts as to the power of Parliament to establish such a court. The question was anything but clear. Therefore, he thought that it was useless to talk about the establishment of a divorce court for the Dominion until they had an amendment to the Constitution. With regard to the subject itself, he was surprised at the feeling exhibited in reference to the Motion. He thought it was the sense of the House clearly expressed on Friday that the Rule should be amended as proposed.

HON. MR. LETELLIER said his reason for bringing forward the Motion the other evening appeared to be well comprehended by the House. Seeing that the House could not otherwise come to a favorable conclusion on the subject, he gave notice of his intention to move the substitution of the fee of \$200, instead of the former one of \$100. The question was now before the House, and it was better that it should be freely discussed.

HON. MR. BENSON did not see that it would be any degradation for parties unable to pay the fee to seek remission of it from this House.

HON. MR. BOTSFORD had listened with much attention to the arguments advanced on both sides. Strong arguments had been advanced in favor of increasing the fee from \$100 to \$200, but nothing should be done calculated to create obstruction to parties seeking redress at the hands of this House.

HON. MR. REESOR was understood to say, we ought to learn something from the experience of our neighbors. In some of the States of the neighboring Republic, divorce laws had existed; but some of the most enlightened of their public men had come to the conclusion that the facilities afforded by such measures had been productive of very serious evils to society. What-ever tends to interfere with the mar-

riage bonds, tends to loosen the bonds of society, thereby exercising a most injurious influence upon free government. It was our duty to avoid all action calculated injuriously to effect our institutions which had worked so well. With regard to the fee, he (Hon. Mr. Reesor) was of opinion that any party willing to incur the expenses connected with a divorce suit could not experience great difficulty in paying the fee of \$200.

HON. MR. VIDAL—There was a great difference between opening the door to divorce and closing the door to the relief of those few unfortunate individuals placed in the unhappy position of seeking remedy by divorce. The question before the House appeared a very simple one, as to whether the House should accept the amendment before it. Whatever our feelings on divorce may be, they should not influence our minds in coming to the discussion of this simple matter. It appeared to him (Hon. Mr. Vidal) that the first and only argument which should be presented to induce the House to agree to this change, is a statement of some kind, that the present charge is insufficient to cover the expenses incurred. Had any hon. gentleman who advocated the change presented the House with any single word of proof that \$100 was insufficient to cover the expense? No.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL said, he thought he had done so. He alluded to the long period occupied in the consideration of these bills in Committee in the House.

HON. MR. VIDAL did not conceive that to be an expense contemplated in the wording of the Rule. (Hear, hear.) His (Hon. Mr. V.'s) impression was, that for the discharge of all duties devolving upon members of that House as Senators, they were amply paid. The attention which they would have to give to divorce bills would not prolong the Session one hour; and in undertaking the duty of Senators, they should be prepared for the discharge of disagreeable as well as agreeable duties. It was their bounden duty, even if not sufficiently paid, patiently to investigate all these cases without looking to the applicants for remuneration. It would be exceedingly unwise for the House to